



## CROWN HILL OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT PUBLIC MEETING # 2

Thursday, April 27, 2006  
Small Faces Child Development Center

### MEETING SUMMARY

**Staff Members**

**Present:**

Pamela Alspaugh, Project Manager/Sr. Landscape Architect; Shwe-jen Hwang, Landscape Architect; Donald Harris, Property Manager; Dennis Cook, Recreation Manager; Rich Macdonald, Seattle P-Patch Program

**Small Faces Staff  
Members present:**

Kathy Brockman; Barbara Stehman

**Meeting:**

The purpose of the meeting was to 1) present design alternatives for the development of Crown Hill Open Space which respond to ideas gathered at the previous public meeting, written comments, and telephone calls; 2) express community response to ideas presented and hear neighbors' preferences and concerns; and 3) reach consensus on park elements to be included and site design.

The meeting was held from 6:30-8:30. About 30 community members attended and most everyone participated in the discussion. They freely shared their preferences and dislikes in an open manner and everyone was quite open to hear what others thought.

The focus of the meeting was a presentation showing three alternatives for the development of the park. The discussion revolved around which park elements the participants would like to see and aspects of each site plan they preferred. The three alternatives showed the same site plan for the ball field and the walk along the 13<sup>th</sup> Ave R/W. All options included picnic spots and seating, swales with naturalized planting. The alternative plans for the central park area included: Site Plan 1) showed a large paved area for a community theater and play/basketball court; a figure 8 loop path with a trike track; a bike/wheel loop path with terrain change; and three small lawn areas. Site Plan 2) showed three separate paved areas for the community theater, basketball/play court, and skate spot; two larger lawn areas; and one loop walking path/trike track. Site Plan 3) showed a consolidated paved area for the community theater, basketball/play court, and skate spot, a figure 8 loop path with trike track, and three smaller lawn areas.

Generally people felt that the alternatives responded well to their previous input. The discussion around the alternative park elements included:

- Community Theater was very positively received. There wasn't necessarily a need for a large paved space. There should be an area around the space that can be used for larger groups to spill over. This space could be a quiet area during other times.
- Play Court/Basketball: not a great need for basketball, full court not needed, make as small as possible to allow for more green space. Space can be used for other play.
- Small Skate Spot: This play element generated the most discussion.

Generally people seemed to agree that they did not want a large skate park for use by expert skateboarders. There was concern that any skate spot would generate noise. There was a fair amount of support for having a small, safe place for younger kids to skate. It was generally agreed that if there was a skate spot, it should be located nearby Holman Road, for visibility and because this area is already too noisy for quiet use. It was agreed that park elements intended for sitting should not also be shared with skates since waxing and dirty skateboard residue makes benches non-useable for sitting.

- The Consolidated area for Theater, Play Court and Skate Spot was liked by quite a few of the participants for the play opportunities but was seen to dominate the open space leaving no quiet area within the central park area. Overall most people wanted the paved areas small and separated to allow for quiet park activities.
- Wavy Walk for Bikes and Skates: People thought this looked fun but generally agreed that a small skate spot would be more desirable and easier to maintain.
- Trike Track along the walking path was seen as desirable and didn't generate concern. Staff from Small Faces would prefer the bike loop closer to the central area.
- Walking Path with Benches was desired by everyone.
- Dog Off Leash area was not shown because of conflict between day care children, dogs, and associated site conditions. Most people supported this decision.
- Open Green Space: was the most desirable park element. People wanted a place for quiet activities in addition to other uses. They wanted as much green space as possible and supported the alternative that had fewer large hard surfaces and the most green area.
- Parking: No additional site parking was shown on any of the plans. While concern for parking was noted, 50 existing parking spaces on the block will remain available. Many people said that walking to the park is preferred. Small Faces could pursue angle parking along 14<sup>th</sup> NW. Some suggested that the planted swale and existing ditch between the ball field and 14<sup>th</sup> Ave. be eliminated and replaced with 10 additional parking spaces.
- P-Patch: Rich Macdonald from Department of Neighborhoods, P-Patch program attended and spoke with the people that were interested in having a P-Patch. If a p-patch is built it will be visually integrated into the park but will be on property that is under the Small Faces master lease and will not be on Parks Dept. maintained property.

After the discussion of park elements and site design the future of the open space was discussed. Parks Property Manager noted that the School District and School Board are currently reviewing proposed school closures. After this they will review long term property uses and hopefully will be able to make a decision regarding the future of Crown Hill School in September. When this has happened Parks Property Managers will begin negotiating a use agreement. Negotiations will take approximately three months and the

project would be bid immediately after an agreement is reached. Construction will take about three months during which time the area would not be open for use. The renovated ball field will be open for play after the grass has gone through a full growing season. Funds for this project total \$1,047,879 from the 2000 ProParks Levy.

**Written Comments:**

- 1.) Thank you for your presentation, it was clear and obviously responsive to community input. I think we need places for older children, to 12 yrs. and beyond- thank you for considering them, and I support that strongly. This could be a skatepark or something else. I like design #2 with the skate park. Thank you for running a great meeting that was challenging at time . Thank you
- 2.) I would like a skate spot in any size from small to large. Prefer skate spot in plan #2 and #3 over separate bike path. I would rather have bike path integrated or use trike area at SFDC when not open for school. Love the path around. Love the community theater, especially if ARC will use.
- 3.) Interested in serving on public art work group.
- 4.) I like option #2.

**Additional Information is Available:**

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/crownHillPark.htm>
- Pamela Alspaugh, Sr. Landscape Architect; [pamela.alspaugh@seattle.gov](mailto:pamela.alspaugh@seattle.gov)